



SpacePolicyOnline.com

A product of Space and Technology Policy Group, LLC

Fact Sheet
Updated May 23, 2017

NASA'S FY2018 BUDGET REQUEST

President Trump released his complete FY2018 budget request on May 23, 2017. The total request for NASA is \$19,092.2 million, a reduction of \$561.1 million from the \$19,653.3 million appropriated by Congress for FY2017.

Compared with many other non-defense federal agencies, NASA fared well. When the FY2018 budget was formulated in March 2017, NASA was operating under a Continuing Resolution at its FY2016 funding level of \$19.265 billion. The Trump request of \$19.1 billion was a reduction of just 0.8 percent. Much deeper cuts were proposed for agencies such as the National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, and Environmental Protection Agency.

Ultimately Congress appropriated more for FY2017 – \$19.653 billion – so the Trump request instead would be a 2.8 percent cut from current spending. NASA Acting Administrator Robert Lightfoot said on May 23 that “The hard choices are still there. We can’t do everything, but we can certainly do a lot.” He characterized the basic message from the Trump Administration as “keep going” and the budget supports NASA’s three strategic thrusts of “Discover, Explore, and Develop.”

On March 16, 2017, the Trump Administration had issued a “[budget blueprint](#)” or “skinny budget” outlining its plans for agencies like NASA that are in the discretionary part of the federal budget. The NASA budget blueprint included the following points:

- "Supports and expands public-private partnerships as the foundation of future U.S. civilian space efforts."
- "Paves the way for eventual over-land commercial supersonic flights and safer, more efficient air travel" providing \$624 million for aeronautics.
- Provides \$1.9 billion for robotic planetary exploration, including Europa Clipper and Mars 2020. It specifically states that no funding for a Europa lander is included.
- Provides \$3.7 billion for the Space Launch System/Orion/exploration ground systems program.
- Cancels the Asteroid Redirect Mission.
- Provides \$1.8 billion for earth science, \$102 million less than the annualized level in the FY2017 Continuing Resolution, terminating four missions: PACE, OCO-3, DSCOVR earth-viewing instruments, and CLARREO Pathfinder. Reduces funds for Earth science research grants.
- Eliminates NASA's Office of Education.
- Restructures the RESTORE-L satellite servicing mission to reduce cost and "better position it to support a nascent commercial satellite servicing industry."
- Strengthens NASA's cybersecurity capabilities.

The complete budget request released on May 23 supersedes the blueprint, but aligns with it, although an additional Earth science mission (the Radiation Budget Instrument) is terminated.

The complete budget also revealed the “out-year” projections for NASA’s budget through FY2022. It is absolutely flat, with no adjustment even for inflation. Acting NASA Chief Scientist Gale Allen [said](#) in April 2017 that a flat budget translated into a reduction of \$3.4 billion in buying power over that period of time.

Key Issues

The earth science budget cuts, the lack of funding for a Europa lander, and the elimination of NASA’s Office of Education are likely to be key issues as Congress deliberates on the budget request. However, many NASA supporters in Congress and the space community are eager to move forward with human exploration beyond low Earth orbit and were hoping the Trump Administration would say something about restoring human missions to the surface of the Moon to NASA’s plan.

That has not happened. In fact, the budget request for SLS and Orion is status quo. It does not support acceleration or expansion of NASA’s human spaceflight plan or include specific funding for the “Deep Space Gateway” NASA officials have been promoting over the past several months as the replacement for the Asteroid Redirect Mission (ARM).

Congress increased NASA’s budget significantly in FY2017 compared to President Obama’s request (see our FY2017 NASA budget fact sheet) and it would not be surprising to see an effort to achieve a similar outcome for FY2018. As explained in the last section of this report, however, conditions are different this year and that may be more difficult.

Earth Science

The Trump Administration is proposing deep cuts to climate change research across the government and NASA’s earth science program was expected to be significantly impacted. However, it was reduced less than many feared. For FY2017, earth science received \$1,921 million; the FY2018 request is \$1,754 million, a reduction of \$167 million.¹

The cut would terminate five NASA earth science missions – PACE, RBI, CLARREO-Pathfinder, OCO-3, and DSCOVR Earth-facing instruments. The last three involve relatively small amounts of money. (Budget numbers below are from NASA’s FY2017 budget book, which included projected budgets through FY2021).

- **PACE**, the Plankton, Aerosol, Clouds and Ocean Ecosystem spacecraft, is the most expensive of the five. PACE will provide high quality global observations about ocean

¹ The March 16 budget blueprint said the reduction was \$108 million, leaving \$1.8 billion. At that time, NASA was funded by a Continuing Resolution at its FY2016 funding level and those figures were correct. The Trump Administration subsequently decided to cancel a fifth earth science mission – RBI – so the figures in the May 23 budget documents do not match those in the March 16 blueprint.

health and its relationship to airborne particles and clouds. Among other things, the data would be used for fisheries management and responding to harmful algae blooms. (Phytoplankton, also called microalgae, are microscopic marine plants that live suspended in water. Fish and other marine life feed on them, but if too many nutrients are available in the water they can grow out of control – bloom – and produce toxic compounds.)

The FY2017 request was \$89 million. The projected requests were \$78.9 million (FY2018), \$144.4 million (FY2019), \$196.0 million (FY2020) and \$137.1 million (FY2021), so a total of \$556.3 million would be saved in those four fiscal years. The mission is cost-capped at \$805 million including launch, operations, and science investigations. Launch is currently scheduled for 2022-2023. PACE is being built and tested at NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center in Greenbelt, MD.

- The **Radiation Budget Instrument (RBI)** is a scanning radiometer that would measure the Earth's reflected sunlight and emitted thermal radiation, continuing measurements made by CERES (Clouds and Earth's Radiant Energy Systems) instruments since 1998. The data would be used as input for extended range (10-day or more) weather forecasts. RBI is designed to fly on one of NOAA's polar-orbiting weather satellites – Joint Polar Satellite System-2 or JPSS-2. (A CERES instrument will be aboard JPSS-1, which is scheduled for launch in September 2017.) The proposal to terminate RBI was attributed to cost growth and technical challenges. Harris Corporation is building RBI under a contract managed by NASA's Langley Research Center in Hampton, VA.

The FY2017 request was \$54.3 million. The projected requests were \$46 million (FY2018), \$17.2 million (FY2019), \$9.4 million (FY2020), and \$6.8 million (FY2021). The savings for FY2018-2021 would be \$79.4 million assuming no termination costs.

- **CLARREO Pathfinder and OCO-3** are instruments that would be attached to the International Space Station (ISS) so are comparatively inexpensive since they are not free-flying satellites.

CLARREO is the Climate Absolute Radiance and Refractivity Observatory, a mission that was recommended by the 2007 Earth Science and Applications from Space Decadal Survey produced by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. In 2016, a decision was made to focus first on a technology demonstration mission – CLARREO Pathfinder – to attach a Reflected Solar Spectrometer to the ISS around 2020. The FY2017 request for CLARREO Pathfinder was \$19 million. The budget projection was for it to grow to \$28 million in FY2018, then ramp down to \$15.4 million in FY2019, \$2.1 million in FY2020 and \$0.2 million in FY2021. Thus the total savings (assuming no termination costs) for FY2018-2021 would be \$45.6 million. CLARREO Pathfinder is managed by NASA's Langley Research Center in Hampton, VA.

OCO is the Orbiting Carbon Observatory. The first OCO was lost in a launch failure. A replacement, OCO-2, was launched in 2014. OCO-3 would use spare parts from OCO-2 to build an instrument to be attached to the ISS. According to NASA, the purpose is to study the distribution of carbon dioxide on Earth as it relates to urban populations and changing patterns of fossil fuel combustion. The FY2017 request was \$26.3 million.

The projection was for that amount to decline to \$9.5 million in FY2018 and \$4.2 million in FY2019, then rise to \$6.6 million in FY2020 and \$6.8 million in FY2021. Termination (assuming no termination costs) would save \$27.1 million in FY2018-2021. OCO-3 is a project of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) in Pasadena, CA.

- **DSCOVR, the Deep Space Climate Observatory**, was launched in 2015. Its primary mission today is to provide space weather data and is funded by NOAA, not NASA. However, NASA designed and built two of the four instruments on DSCOVR: the Earth-Polychromatic Imaging Camera (EPIC) that constantly provides full-disk views of Earth from the spacecraft's vantage point 1.5 million kilometers away, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology Advanced Radiometer (NISTAR).

The Trump budget request proposes eliminating funding for these two "earth-facing" (as opposed to Sun-facing) instruments. In the NASA budget, DSCOVR is funded at \$1.7 million in FY2017. The projection is for that to decline to \$1.2 million in both FY2018 and FY2019, \$0.8 million in FY2020, and zero in FY2021. That represents a total savings (assuming no termination costs) of \$3.2 million from FY2018-2021. NASA said in a March 17, 2017 email to SpacePolicyOnline.com that its money is used for analysis and processing of the data from the two NASA-provided instruments.

DSCOVR originated in the Clinton Administration where it was championed by Vice President Al Gore. His goal was to have a satellite that provided a constant view of Earth to help remind everyone of the fragility of the planet and its climate. He named the spacecraft Triana, but it was harshly criticized by Republicans in Congress and dubbed "Goresat." After a review by the National Academy of Sciences, science instruments were added to make it more scientifically valuable, but President George W. Bush suspended the program when he took office. The satellite remained in storage throughout most of the Bush term, but was resurrected and launched during the Obama Administration. Today it is operated by NOAA since its primary role is providing space weather data, a NOAA responsibility.

Budget savings do not appear to be the driving force for proposing these terminations. Instead, it apparently is based on Trump Administration skepticism about climate change. In releasing the budget blueprint on March 16, White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Director Mick Mulvaney said of climate change research: "We're not spending money on that anymore. We consider that to be a waste of your money to go out and do that." The Trump budget proposal cancels or sharply reduces funding for climate change initiatives across the government.

Many congressional critics of NASA's earth science program are climate change skeptics, but the argument is rarely couched in those terms. Instead, the line of reasoning is that other federal agencies study the Earth, but only NASA sends probes to other places in the solar system, launches telescopes into space, or supports human exploration of space. They argue those are NASA's core missions, not earth science. Supporters of NASA's earth science program note that the 1958 National Aeronautics and Space Act that created NASA lists "expansion of human knowledge of phenomena in the atmosphere and space" first among the agency's objectives.

Planetary Science: A Mission to Europa

Congress is a strong supporter of NASA's planetary science program on a bipartisan basis. Attempts by the Obama Administration to cut funding for planetary science in recent years were firmly rejected. The Trump budget request provides a substantial boost compared to President Obama's request for FY2017 (from \$1.39 billion to \$1.93 billion), but is only slightly more than what Congress ultimately appropriated for FY2017 (\$1.85 billion).

One planetary science program – robotic exploration of Jupiter's moon Europa -- has particularly enthusiastic support from Rep. John Culberson (R-TX), who chairs the House appropriations Commerce-Justice-Science (CJS) subcommittee that funds NASA. Europa has an ocean under its icy crust and some scientists believe conditions there might be suitable for microbial life to develop. Culberson has said in many venues that he believes there is life in Europa's ocean and he is intent on funding spacecraft to find it.

Culberson already has added substantial amounts to NASA's budget to initiate a Europa mission even though NASA had no plans to do so. NASA generally follows the recommendations of the Decadal Surveys written by scientific experts under the aegis of the National Academy of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine. The most recent Decadal Survey for planetary science identified a series of missions aimed at returning a sample of Mars to Earth as its top priority for a large "flagship" program. A mission to Europa was listed second, primarily because of its high cost. The report left open the possibility that a lower cost Europa mission would be a higher priority if more funding than expected became available.

Project managers at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) reformulated the mission to lower the cost and Culberson added the money. The mission, Europa Clipper, involves a spacecraft that will orbit Jupiter and make multiple flybys of Europa, some of them close to the surface. Fissures in Europa's icy surface allow material from the ocean to spew out and some scientists believe plumes rise above the surface to an altitude the spacecraft could reach.

Culberson put language in the FY2017 Consolidated Appropriations Act (P.L. 115-31) that Europa Clipper is to be launched in 2022 using NASA's new big rocket, the Space Launch System (SLS), which is currently under development. Acting NASA Chief Financial Officer Andrew Hunter said during a media briefing on May 23, 2017 that the FY2018 request for Europa Clipper – \$425 million – is not sufficient to meet the 2022 launch date and it is a "challenge" to fulfill the requirements in the law. He added that NASA has informed Congress of how much money would be needed to meet that launch date. NASA's FY2018 budget book says that the requested funding level supports a launch date in the mid-to-late 2020s.

Culberson also wants NASA to build a second spacecraft that could land on the surface and specified in law that it be launched by 2024 also on SLS. NASA is formulating a concept for that lander in accordance with the law, but the FY2018 budget specifically does not include funding for it. NASA's budget book says no funding is provided to "send another flagship mission to Europa before analysis of the Europa Clipper data is completed."

This is certain to provoke debate because of Culberson's determination and influential position as chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee that funds NASA. If he presses ahead with the requirement that Europa Clipper be launched by 2022 and a lander by 2024, the

question will be whether he adds money to the budget or requires NASA to find the funds from within its other programs.

Education

NASA funds education activities both through its Office of Education and as part of science missions in the Science Mission Directorate (SMD). Generally speaking, these efforts are part of an effort to encourage students to study Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) fields, which has been supported on a bipartisan basis in the White House and Congress for many years.

The Trump budget request, however, eliminates NASA's Office of Education, funded at \$100 million in FY2017. The FY2018 request includes \$37 million, but that is for close out activities only. The March Trump budget blueprint asserted that the Office of Education "has experienced significant challenges in implementing a NASA-wide education strategy and is performing functions that are duplicative of other parts of the agency."

The criticism may come as a surprise to many in Congress and the science community. Efforts in the Obama Administration to streamline STEM education programs across the government were firmly rejected by Congress on a bipartisan basis. During that period, NASA's education programs were reassessed and reconfigured to better differentiate between Office of Education and SMD activities.

Programs within NASA's Office of Education are very popular in Congress, which routinely adds money to the amounts requested by whatever Administration is in power. Three programs of special interest to many Members of Congress are the following:

- [National Space Grant and Fellowship Program](#), a national network of 850 affiliates in colleges, universities, industry, museums, science centers, and state and local agencies in all 50 states plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico that fund fellowships and scholarships for students in STEM fields.
- [Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research \(EPSCoR\)](#) that provides seed funding to enable [27 jurisdictions](#) (24 states plus Guam, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands) to develop academic research enterprises directed toward long-term, self-sustaining, nationally-competitive capabilities in aerospace and aerospace-related research.
- [Minority University Research and Education Program \(MUREP\)](#) that enhances the capabilities of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs), and Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs) through grants with the goal of recruiting underrepresented and underserved students into STEM fields through completion of undergraduate or graduate degrees.

During the May 23, 2017 budget briefing, Hunter specifically stated that the \$37 million requested for FY2018 does not fund any of those programs. He added that NASA anticipates Congress will add money for them and the agency is still determining how it would manage those programs absent the Office of Education.

Human Spaceflight: Asteroid Redirect Mission (ARM) and Deep Space Gateway

As explained in previous editions of these NASA budget fact sheets, NASA continues to try to define its future human spaceflight program. Today it is centered on utilization of the International Space Station (ISS), but that is seen as just the first step towards eventual human trips to Mars. While there is broad consensus that human exploration of Mars is the “horizon goal,” there is less agreement on the steps to getting there.

Asteroid Redirect Mission. President George W. Bush set the country on the path to returning humans to the Moon by 2020 as a step towards Mars, but President Obama cancelled that program (Constellation) and replaced it with the Asteroid Redirect Mission (ARM). Obama’s decision sparked intense congressional backlash from both Democrats and Republicans. In the end, Congress passed the 2010 NASA Authorization Act that directed NASA to build a big new rocket, the Space Launch System (SLS), and a crew spacecraft (Orion), with the goal of eventually sending people to Mars while allowing ARM to proceed.

ARM has been explained in previous editions of these NASA budget fact sheets. In brief, President Obama wanted to send astronauts to an asteroid by 2025 instead of returning to the lunar surface as the next step to Mars. Over time, ARM evolved into a program where a robotic probe would be sent to an asteroid to pick up a boulder from its surface and move the boulder into lunar orbit where it would be visited by astronauts in an Orion spacecraft.

The Trump budget request proposes terminating ARM. It never gained popularity in Congress so the proposal is not expected to generate opposition. The two aspects of ARM that do have wide support – finding and tracking asteroids and developing high power solar electric propulsion (SEP) – would continue in the Trump budget.

Deep Space Gateway. Since the beginning of the Trump Administration, NASA human spaceflight officials have shifted focus from ARM to what they call a Deep Space Gateway (DSG) to be built in lunar orbit instead. It would now become the next steppingstone to Mars. The DSG is still conceptual, but NASA describes it as a facility that could be used to support human missions to the lunar surface by international or commercial partners (NASA itself still has no plans to return humans to the lunar surface) as well as a “gateway” where crews would get ready to board Deep Space Transports to travel to Mars.

The FY2018 budget request, however, does not include funding for the DSG. NASA Acting CFO Andrew Hunter said at the May 23 budget briefing that NASA was “somewhat inhibited” in proceeding with it because of the flat budgets with no inflation adjustment in the future. He is hopeful that NASA will be successful in convincing the Trump Administration and Congress to support the DSG in the future.

Perhaps ironically, President Trump said [recently](#) that he wants to get people to Mars “sooner rather than later” and even suggested that it happen while he is President. The budget request certainly does not support such a goal.

Outlook for NASA's FY2018 Appropriations Debate

NASA's appropriations are part of the Commerce-Justice-Science (CJS) bill, one of 12 appropriations bills on which Congress is supposed to act in each fiscal year. The House and Senate Appropriations Committees have CJS subcommittees. The House CJS subcommittee is chaired by Rep. John Culberson (R-TX), while the Senate CJS subcommittee is chaired by Sen. Richard Shelby (R-AL). They held those positions in the last Congress as well. The top Democrats in the 115th Congress are Rep. Jose Serrano (D-NY) and Sen. Jeanne Shaheen (D-NH), succeeding Rep. Mike Honda (D-CA), who lost his reelection bid, and Sen. Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), who retired.

The Appropriations Committees face a challenging task. They appropriate funds for the "discretionary" part of the federal budget, which is approximately one-third of total federal spending. The other two-thirds is for "mandatory" spending such as Medicare and Social Security and interest on the national debt, over which they have no jurisdiction.

Discretionary spending is divided into "defense" and "non-defense." NASA is part of non-defense discretionary spending.

The Trump budget proposal is to add \$54 billion to defense and cut \$54 billion from non-defense compared to the spending caps set by law in the 2011 Budget Control Act (BCA). The BCA sets total FY2018 discretionary spending at \$1.065 trillion: \$549 billion for defense and \$516 billion for non-defense.

The BCA has been discussed in prior year versions of this fact sheet. In essence, if Congress exceeds the caps set by law, automatic across-the-board cuts called a "sequester" go into effect. The cuts are made equally to every defense and non-defense discretionary program regardless of their relative merits. That happened in FY2013. The resulting effects were so harmful that Congress and the White House agreed to relax the limits for FY2014-2015 and then for FY2016-2017, but the BCA caps extend through 2023 and there is no agreement for those years. Trump said in his budget blueprint that he "repeals" the sequester for defense spending, but he cannot repeal the law (Congress would have to do that), he can only ignore the caps, as did President Obama in FY2017. In Trump's case, he raised the amount for defense and cut non-defense by an equal amount, holding to the top line, but supporters of the non-defense programs are certain to oppose it. Proposed cuts to the State Department and foreign aid produced an immediate outcry and a leading Republican Senator, Lindsey Graham (R-SC), called the budget proposal "dead on arrival." That sentiment has been echoed by a number of Republicans and Democrats since.

Even supporters of defense spending are unhappy saying the proposed increase is too little. The chairmen of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees (Rep. Mac Thornberry and Sen. John McCain) both criticized the request as falling short of what Trump promised during his campaign and what is needed for a strong military.

Although NASA fared well in the Trump proposal compared to other non-defense agencies, it will be up to the appropriators to decide which programs to fund and which to cut. For example, the CJS subcommittee funds not only NASA, but the National Science Foundation (NSF), the Department of Commerce (including NOAA), and the Department of Justice, all of which have

many popular programs. Through the congressional budget process, each of the subcommittees will be allocated a set amount of money to spend. The CJS subcommittees will have to decide whether to fund a science program at NASA or NSF or a weather satellite or fisheries program at NOAA or a community policing program at the Department of Justice, for example.

Rep. Rodney Frelinghuysen (R-NJ), who chairs the full House Appropriations Committee, issued a statement on May 23, 2017 noting that only Congress has the “power of the purse” and his committee will analyze the Trump request thoroughly and hold hearings. “Only then can Congress put forward our own plan...”

Table 1: NASA's FY2018 Budget Request
(in \$ millions, see notes below)

Account	FY2016 Approps	FY2017 Approps	FY2018 Request	Authorization			Appropriations		
				House	Senate	Final	House	Senate	Final
Science	5,589.4	5,764.9	5,771.8						
<i>Earth Science</i>	1,921.0	1,921.0	1,754.1						
<i>Planetary Science</i>	1,631.0	1,846.0	1,929.5						
<i>Astrophysics</i>	730.6	750.0	816.7						
<i>JWST</i>	620.0	569.4	533.7						
<i>Heliophysics</i>	649.8	678.4	677.8						
<i>Education</i>	^{note 3} 37.0	<i>note 3</i>	<i>note 3</i>						
Aeronautics	640.0	660.0	624.0						
Space Technology	686.5	686.5	678.6						
Exploration	4,030.0	4,324.0	3,934.1						
<i>Expl Sys Dev</i>	3,680.0	3,929.0	3,584.1						
<i>(Orion)</i>	(1,270.0)	(1,350.0)	(1,186.0)						
<i>(SLS)</i>	(2,000.0)	(2,150.0)	(1,937.8)						
<i>(Expl Ground Sys)</i>	(410.0)	(429.0)	(460.4)						
<i>Expl R&D</i>	350.0	395.0	350.0						
Space Operations	5,029.2	4,950.7	4,740.8						
<i>ISS</i>	N/A	N/A	1,490.6						
<i>Space Trans</i>	N/A	N/A	2,415.1						
<i>(Cmrcl Crew)</i>	(1,243.9)	(1,184.8)	(731.9)						
<i>(Crew and Cargo)^{note 4}</i>	N/A	(1,028.0)	(1,683.2)						
<i>Space & Flt Sprt</i>	N/A	N/A	835.0						
Education	115.0	100.0	37.3						
Safety/Security/MS	2,768.6	2,768.6	2,830.2						
CECR	388.9	360.7	496.1						
Inspector General	37.4	37.9	39.3						
TOTAL	19,285.0	19,653.3	19,092.2						

Notes: (1) Columns may not add due to rounding. Text and numbers in *italics* are subtotals. Text and numbers in (*italics in parentheses*) are sub-subtotals. N/A = not applicable or not available. FY2016 and FY2017 appropriations figures are from the congressional appropriations documents. They often are adjusted by NASA operating plans throughout the year so may not match what is in NASA's FY2018 budget request documentation.

(2) For information on the FY2017 request and congressional action, see the FY2017 version of this Fact Sheet. NASA's final FY2017 appropriations are in Division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017 (P.L. 115-31), colloquially called "the omnibus"; these figures are from the bill and its [accompanying explanatory statement](#).

(3) For FY2017, NASA incorporated funding for education-related activities in SMD within the astrophysics budget (\$25 million) and the earth science budget (\$6 million). Congress routinely breaks SMD education funding out into a separate line item, as shown here for FY2016. However, for FY2017, the Senate Appropriations Committee followed NASA's lead and allocated \$42 million for education as part of the astrophysics budget. The FY2017 omnibus appropriations bill calls out the total in the text of the report, \$37 million, but not in the accompanying table. The report states the money is to come equally from planetary science and astrophysics and managed for all of the Science Mission Directorate by the Astrophysics Division. For FY2018, the request within the Astrophysics Division is \$44 million.

(4) The NASA request in this line is labeled "crew and cargo" and pays not only for commercial cargo flights to ISS, but payments to Russia for taking U.S., European, Japanese and Canadian crews to and from ISS on Soyuz spacecraft. The language in the Senate report refers only to \$1.028 billion provided for cargo. No mention is made of the Soyuz payments. Since the report does not specify the amounts for line items such as ISS or Space and Flight Support, it may be that it allocated more for this line than shown in the report, or it is providing NASA flexibility on how to spend the other funds in this account.

**Table 2: Funding for the Space Launch System: NASA Request versus Congressional Appropriations
(in \$ millions)**

Account: Subaccount	FY2014	FY2015		FY2016		FY2017		FY2018
	Enacted	Request	Final	Request	Final	Request	Final	Request
Exploration: Exploration Systems Development/ SLS	1,600.0	1,380.3	1,700.0	1,356.5	2,000.0 (incl \$85 M for EUS)	1,310.3	2,150.0	1,937.8
Exploration: Exploration Systems Development/ Exploration Ground Systems	318.2	351.3	351.3	410.1	410.0	429.4	429.0	460.4
CECR: Exploration Construction of Facilities	*139.3	52.3	*67.9	10.0	*28.3	8.8	Not specified	*95.9
TOTAL	2,057.5	1,783.9	2,119.2	1,776.6	2,410.0	1,748.7		2,494.1

Notes: CECR = Construction, Environmental Compliance and Restoration. EUS is the Exploration Upper Stage, which is needed for SLS missions beyond Exploration Mission-1. NASA did not request EUS funding in FY2016.

* The \$139.3 figure for FY2014 CECR is from NASA's FY2016 budget request. The CECR funding figure for FY2015 is from NASA's FY2017 budget book, p. EXP-19. Figures for FY2016 and the FY2018 request is from the FY2018 budget book, p. CECR-19, which does not show how much was allocated for FY2017. The CECR funding is for SLS, Orion and Exploration Ground Systems.